## Case 1:23-cv-01563-JLT-SKO Document 35 Filed 12/30/24 Page 2 of 3

On December 10, 2024, Plaintiff failed to appear at the settlement conference.

Accordingly, the Court issued its Order For Warden Of California State Prison, Lancaster To Show Cause ("OSC") Why Sanctions Should Not Be Imposed For Failure To Comply With A Court Order on December 11, 2024. (ECF No. 33.) The warden was directed to respond within 14 days. (*Id.* at 2.)

On December 23, 2024, the warden filed a response to the OSC. (ECF No. 34.)

## II. DISCUSSION

The warden's response to the OSC (ECF No. 34) is supported by the Declaration of J. Orellana, Litigation Coordinator at California State Prison, Lancaster ("CSP-LAC"). (ECF No. 34-1.) The warden advises that on December 10, 2024, Plaintiff was housed in restricted housing facility DB5. (ECF No. 34 at 2; ECF No. 34-1, ¶ 3.) The facility has a limited number of officers whose duties include escorting inmates to and from appointments and video conferences. (ECF No. 34 at 2.) At about 12:30 p.m., four different officers in the facility responded to multiple medical emergencies involving different inmates, including one claiming to experience suicidal ideation. (ECF No. 34 at 2; ECF No. 34-1, ¶ 7.) Those emergencies took the officers away from their regular duties, directly affecting the time it took to retrieve Plaintiff for his video conference. (Id.) Further, the warden states a number of other factors compounded the delay, including the manner of transportation given the high security level in facility DB5, the required search of the inmate prior to transportation, and the slow movement by the inmate given shackling of his hands and feet, coupled with the significant distance between the housing unit and the video conference room. (ECF No. 34 at 2-3; see also ECF No. 34-1, ¶ 5.)¹ Plaintiff arrived at the video conference room at around 1:30 p.m.; unfortunately, by the time the escorting officers set up the video conference, the conference had already been concluded. (ECF No. 34 at 3; ECF No. 34-1, ¶ 9.) CSP-LAC staff work expeditiously to process and execute court orders and to ensure inmates arrive at appearances in a timely manner. (ECF No. 34-1, ¶ 10.) Unfortunately, due to unexpected circumstances, staff were delayed on this occasion. (Id.) The warden states Plaintiff's failure to

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

<sup>27</sup> 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Defense contacted Orellana on that date concerning Plaintiff's delay. (Doc. 34-1, ¶ 8.) At that time, Orellana acknowledged there had been a delay, but was not aware of the specific reason. (*Id.*)

## timely appear did not involve willful disobedience and apologizes to the Court for the inconvenience and expense caused. (ECF No. 34 at 4.) III. **CONCLUSION AND ORDER** Based upon the foregoing, the Court **HEREBY ORDERS**: 1. The OSC issued December 11, 2024 (ECF No. 33) is **DISCHARGED**; and 2. Defense counsel is **DIRECTED** to contact Sujean Park, **no later than January 8**, 2025, to reschedule the settlement conference in this matter. IT IS SO ORDERED. UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE Dated: **December 30, 2024**

Case 1:23-cv-01563-JLT-SKO Document 35 Filed 12/30/24 Page 3 of 3